D. REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and reexamination of the present application in light of the following amendments and remarks.

Status of the Claims & Statement Regarding Claim Amendments and Cancellations

Claims 14 and 23 are currently pending in the application and are currently amended. Claims 1-13, 15-22, and 24-31 are now canceled.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 14 and 23 and canceled claims 1-13, 15-22, and 24-31 from further consideration in this application. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-31 prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 14 and 23 were amended and claims 1-13, 15-22, and 24-31 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-31, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101

The Office Action rejects claims 26-31 under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. [Office Action, p. 2] Applicants have canceled claims 26-31 from further consideration in the present application, therefore the rejection under 35 USC 101 is not applicable to the pending claims.

Pending Claims are Not Anticipated or Obvious in view of the Cited Prior Art

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4-6, 10-14, 17-19, 23-26, and 30-31 under 35 USC 102(e) as bein unpatentable over Fault-Tolerant Grid Architecture and Practice to

Hai et al. [Office Action, p. 3] In addition, the Office Action rejects claims 2-3, 15-16, and 27-28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hai et al in view of US patent 6,594,684 to Hodjat et al. The Office Action also rejects claims 7, 9, 20, 22, and 29 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hai et al in view of US Publication 2003/0126240 to Vosseler. In addition, the Office Action rejects claims 8 and 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hai et al. in view of Vosseler and further in view of Ellis (US Patent 7,086,086).

Only claims 14 and 23 are currently pending in the application. In traversing the rejection of these claims, Applicants note that elements from previous dependent claims are incorporated into claim 14 and traverse these rejections as well.

Claim 14, as amended, reads:

Claim 14 (Currently Amended): A method for managing error analysis within a grid environment, comprising:

enabling a grid environment comprising a plurality of computing systems each comprising at least one resource and communicatively connected over a network layer through a grid management system to share each said at least one resource through at least one web service layer atop at least one grid service layer implemented within an open grid services architecture;

receiving, at a first agent implemented within said at least one web service layer and said at least one grid service layer, a plurality of types of error messages generated from [[a]] said plurality of computing diverse systems and said grid management system, within [[a]] said grid environment;

parsing, by said first agent, each particular error message from among [[of]] said plurality of types of error messages to determine a general error indicator, an application identifier, and a requester identifier sending said particular error message; and

determining, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, at least one designated policy for said requester identifier;

validating, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, at least one designated policy against a document type definition (DTD) designated for said application identifier to determine an XML response;

determining, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, whether said associated XML response resolves an error in each said particular error message;

        responsive to said first agent determining for each said particular
error message that said associated XML response resolves said error,
adjusting a formatting of said associated XML response by a formatting
policy specified for said requester identifier to a solution and transmitting
said solution to a requester identified by said requester identifier; and
        responsive to said first agent determining for each said particular
error message that said associated XML responsive fails to resolve said
error, packaging each said particular error message and distributing each
said particular error message to at least one second agent within said grid
environment, wherein said at least one second agent specializes in
resolving errors not resolvable by said first agent.
        ~~attempting to resolve said general error indicator for each of said~~
~~plurality of parsed error messages and return a solution to each of said~~
~~plurality of error messages, such that error analysis of a plurality of types~~
~~of error messages in said grid environment is handled by said first agent~~
~~rather than by said plurality of diverse systems.~~

First, Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter is added through the
amendments to the claims. The specification of the present application and Figures
teach each of the amended elements as noted:

enabling a grid environment comprising a plurality of computing systems each
comprising at least one resource and communicatively connected over a network layer
through a grid management system to share each said at least one resource through at
least one web service layer atop at least one grid service layer implemented within an
open grid services architecture; (Figure 3 and paragraphs 0042-0044 and 0046-0048)

receiving, at a first agent implemented within said at least one web service layer
and said at least one grid service layer, a plurality of types of error messages generated
from said plurality of computing systems and said grid management system, within said
grid environment; (Paragraphs 0065, 0066, and 0067)

parsing, by said first agent, each particular error message from among [[of]] said
plurality of types of error messages to determine a general error indicator, an
application identifier, and a requester identifier sending said particular error message;
(Paragraphs 0076, 0077, and 0078 and Figure 8, element 804)

determining, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, at least one designated policy for said requester identifier; (Paragraphs 0076-0078 and Figure 8, element 806)

validating, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, at least one designated policy against a document type definition (DTD) designated for said application identifier to determine an XML response; (Paragraphs 0075-0078 and Table 1 and Figure 8, element 808)

determining, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, whether said associated XML response resolves an error in each said particular error message; (Paragraphs 0076 and 0079 and Figure 8, element 810)

responsive to said first agent determining for each said particular error message that said associated XML response resolves said error, adjusting a formatting of said associated XML response by a formatting policy specified for said requester identifier to a solution and transmitting said solution to a requester identified by said requester identifier; (Paragraphs 0079 and Figure 8, elements 810, 812, 814, and 816)

responsive to said first agent determining for each said particular error message that said associated XML responsive fails to resolve said error, packaging each said particular error message and distributing each said particular error message to at least one second agent within said grid environment, wherein said at least one second agent specializes in resolving errors not resolvable by said first agent. (Paragraphs 0077 and 0081 and Figure 8, element 830, claim 15)

In view of the supportive teachings for each of the claimed elements, Applicants respectfully request entry and allowance of the pending claims.

Second, Applicants respectfully assert that regardless of whether the previous rejection of claim 14 under Hai is correct, claim 14 as amended is not anticipated by Hai or obvious under Hai in view of Vosseler and Ellis. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that Hai does not teach or enable each of the elements of parsing, by said first agent, each particular error message from among said plurality of types of error

messages to determine a general error indicator, an application identifier, and a requester identifier sending said particular error message. Applicants note that with respect to the rejection of claim 14, the Office Action cites page 425 of Hai et al. as describing "FTGP should detect component faults and adopt different fault handling strategies for different component types" and page 430 of Hai et al. as describing "if a local monitor reports an application failure to data collector, the handling center can receive such information and help to reconstruct the application." [Office Action, p. 4] Applicants respectfully submit that neither these portions of Hai et al or other portions of Hai et al. describe the agent of claim 14, which can operate in both the web service layer and grid service layer, which parses each error message from systems within the grid environment to determine a general error indicator, an application identifier and a requester identifier for the error message.

In addition, Applicants note that claim 14 is amended to incorporate elements similar to elements previous described in claims 20 and 21 of determining, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, at least one designated policy for said requester identifier or validating, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, at least one designated policy against a document type definition (DTD) designated for said application identifier to determine an XML response. As to claim 20, the Office Action states that Hai "fails to teach a for managing error analysis within a grid environment, wherein said parsing controller selects a particular policy according to said general error indicator from among said plurality of policies and wherein said resolution controller to resolve said general error indicator according to said particular policy" but that Vosseler describes "for managing error analysis within a grid environment, wherein said parsing controller selects a particular policy according to said general error indicator from a plurality of policies and wherein said resolution controller to resolve said general error indicator according to said particular policy" in page 3, paragraph 0026. As to claim 21, Applicants note that the Office Action states that Hai in view of Vosseler "fails to teach a system for managing error analysis within a grid environment,w herein said plurality of policies are validated against an XML document

type definition", but the Office Action cites Ellis as describing "a system for managing error analysis within a grid environment , wherein a plurality of policies are validated against an XML document type definition" in col. 12, lines 13-26.

Applicants note that claim 14 does not include the same elements as claims 20 and 21, but Applicants traverse these rejections in view of the amended elements.

In particular, Ellis in col. 12, lines 13-18 describes "The main server may also invoke agent methods 830 to deploy and enforce security policies on the host that the agent is running on and on hosts tat the agent has discovered. The agent can communicate with the local host and hosts that is has discovered using XML, SNMP, CLI, TLI, or a predefined protocol for communicating with the host." Applicants respectfully assert that Ellis does not teach validating policies against an XML DTD, but merely describes enforcing a security policy by communicating using XML as the protocol for communicating with a host. Thus, Ellis also does not teach validating, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, at least one designated policy against a document type definition (DTD) designated for said application identifier to determine an XML response and Applicants submit that the element is also not obvious under Hai, Vosseler, and Ellis.

In addition, paragraph 0026 of Vosseler describes that for an agent running on a remote device or computer system and monitoring a cluster package, the agent is "configured by a set of specifications and rules, called policty, for each cluster package application or process to be monitored. Policies can be user-defined". Regardless of whether Vosseler describes a policy associated with a requester, Vosseler's policy is not described as data which can be validated against a DTD designated for an application to determine an XML response to an error. Thus, Applicants submit that Vosseler does not teach the designated policy which is validated against a DTD of claim 14 when claim 14 is considered as a whole and Applicants submit that determining, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, at least one designated policy for said requester identifier and validating, by said first agent, for each said particular error message, at least one designated policy against a document type definition (DTD)

<u>designated for said application identifier to determine an XML response</u> are also not obvious under Hai, Vosseler and Ellis.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claim 14.

Claim 23

Applicants respectfully assert that because claim 14 is allowable, claim 23, which depends on claim 14 is allowable as a dependent claim of an allowable independent claim and should be allowed. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Additional Information which may be Material to Patentability

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to several matters regarding information which may be material to patentability in the present application.

Applicants note that the present application cites an application which is co-pending with the present application, which is incorporated by reference into the present application. As noted in the amendments to the specification, Applicants clarify that this applications to which the present application is cross-referenced, include US Patent Application Serial No. 10/757,282. Applicants note that under the new rule promulgated under 37 CFR 1.78(f)(1), but not yet enforced, the Office requires that all related applications should be listed, where related applications are defined as applications which have a filing date that is the same or within 2 months of the filing date of the present application taking into account benefit filing dates, share at least one common inventor, and share a common assignee. Applicants note that in the spirit of the recently promulgated rules under 37 CFR 1.78(f)(1), Patent Application serial nos. 10/756,138 and 10/756,134 may also be considered related applications that are co-pending with the present application, and Applicants therefore fulfill the duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office to disclose information with Applicants' knowledge as to other co-pending application, including material rejections in co-

pending applications, as described in 37 CFR 1.56 and recently clarified in *McKesson Information Solutions, Inc. v. Bridge Medical, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 897, 82 USPQ2d 1865 (May 18, 2007).

Applicants received an Office Action in 10/757,272 from Examiner Meng Yao Zhe, dated 12/26/2007. In addition, Applicants received an Office Action in 10/756,138 from Examiner Meng Yao Zhe, dated 10/31/2007 and Applicants filed a response to this action, dated 01/31/08. Applicants received an Office Action in 10/756,138 from Examiner Tariq Najee-Ullah dated 09/27/07, and Applicants filed a response to this action, dated 02/27/08.

Conclusion

Applicants note the citation of pertinent prior art cited by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.

No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Amy J. Pattillo, Reg. No. 46,983/
   AMY J. PATTILLO
   Registration No. 46,983
   P.O. BOX 161327
   AUSTIN, TEXAS 78716
   ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
   Telephone: 512-402-9820
   Facsimile: 512-306-0417